

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/719,900	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ZHOU, XUE MEI	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jehanne S. Sitton	<b>Art Unit</b> 1634	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jehanne S. Sitton.

(2) Sandra Wells.

Date of Interview: 3 May 2006 <sup>2007</sup>
*g.a.  
5/30/07*
**Status of Application:** non final rejection

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that although the intended scope of the claims in the response appeared to be directed to the specific 25 base pair sequences of SEQ ID NOS 1-982,914, the use of the term "comprising" and the reference to probes in the second wherein clause could be construed to allow for additional nucleotide sequences on either side. The examiner indicated that the use of the term in the 2nd wherein clause in the scope of enablement rejection was in error. The examiner suggested the following examiner's amendment to claim 1 so that the use of the term "comprising" would modify the plurality instead of the probes. The applicant's representative agreed to the changes in the attached examiner's amendment.